

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action date December 5, 2006. In the Office Action, claims 1-6, 9, 10, 13, 15, 18, 21, 22 and 25 were rejected and claims 7, 8, 11, 12 and 16-24 were objected to but would be allowable if written in dependent form. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter, however, it should be noted that the Examiner has indicated that claims 18, 21 and 22 are both rejected and objected to. For purposes of this response, the Applicant has assumed that these claims are rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1, 15, 16 and 25 are amended. It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims 1-13 and 15-25 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-6, 9-10, 13, 15, 18, 21, 22 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenberg et al. (US 6,104,558). Claims 1, 15, 16 and 25 have been amended.

On page two of the Office Action, the Examiner has concluded that "although, Greenberg et al. discloses consecutive placed bit groups as depicted in fig.5, he doesn't specifically discloses the bit groups are identical." The Examiner further explains that "in the instant specification in page 12, lines 23-28, the identical bit group indicates the sector number (i.e. a circumferential location), and as disclosed in the cited reference, the consecutive bit groups uniquely identify the sector on the disk for verification of data before a read or write operation (see col.5, lines 59-65), therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the sequence as disclosed by Greenberg et al. to implement identical bit groups, because it is up to the user to encode the unique identifier (i.e. sector number, head number) using random, different, or identical bits for the purpose of obtaining more accurate positioning on the medium." The Applicants respectively traverse the Examiner's rejection.

In accordance with MPEP §2143, it is respectfully submitted that the cited reference fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 25. In particular, the cited reference fails to teach or suggest that "all of the servo sectors in each bit-group set includes bit-groups having identical bits." Although Greenberg et al. discloses bits that indicate sector number, Greenberg et al. does not teach or suggest that a track of sectors is divided into bit-group sets that are interspersed about the track and that all servo sectors in each bit-group set includes

bit-groups having identical bits. At most, the Examiner's reasoning would conclude that every sector on a track in Greenberg et al. would have identical bits in the sector number portion of the servo sector based on an encoding scheme. This is simply not the case in claim 1. In claim 1 only interspersed bit-group sets on the track include bit-groups that are identical. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 25 are in condition for allowance. It then follows that claims 2-13 are also in condition for allowance at least based on their dependence on allowable claim 1.

Claim 15 has been amended to incorporate features of claim 16. Claim 16 was indicated as including allowable subject matter. It is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is in condition for allowance. It then follows that claims 16-24 are also in condition for allowance at least based on their dependence on allowable claim 15.

It is respectfully submitted that in light of the above remarks, claims 1-13 and 15-24 are patentable over the cited reference. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Leanne R. Taveggia/
Leanne R. Taveggia, Reg. No. 53,675
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244
Phone: (612) 334-3222
Fax: (612) 334-3312

LRT/jme